UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/490,772	01/24/2000	Reinhard Heinrich Hohensee	BLD990043US1	7611

			EXAMINER
7590	01/03/2005		PARK, CHAN S

David W Lynch
Crawford Maunu PLLC
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
Mendota Heights, MN 55120

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2622	

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 July 2004*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 44-68* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 44-68* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Applicant's amendment was received on 7/30/04, and has been entered and

made of record. Currently, **claims 1-18 and 44-68** are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1-18 and 44-68** have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Drawings

3.   New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this

application because the Office never received the corrected drawings. Applicant is

advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office,

as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The

corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of

the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

4.   Claims are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claim 1, "a printing system" in line 3, should be "the printing system"

Regarding claims 46 and 47, "capture storage" should be "the capture storage"

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Myers et

al. U.S. Patent No. 6,665,672 (hereinafter Myers).

5.   With respect to claim 1, Myers teaches a method for enabling re-use

presentation objects by a printing system, comprising:

identifying an object (print data object for the print job) in a print data stream

(object data either sent by computer 14 in col. 5, lines 65-66) for presentation by a

printing system (col. 5, lines 61-66 and col. 6, lines 30-36), and

generating at the printing system (print agent 16b) a globally-unique identifier for

assignment to the object (col. 6, lines 2-5 & lines 30-36).

Note that Examiner interprets the transaction as the object (last sentence of

ABSTRACT and col. 1, lines 11-13).

Referring to the applicant's response, wherein on page 14, lines 3-5, the

applicant acknowledges that the globally unique transaction (object) identifier is

produced/generated by the root transaction method. It should be noted that the print

agent 16b, which is a part of the printing system 16, generates this root transaction

(specifically col. 6, lines 2-3). Thus, Myers teaches the method for generating globally-

unique identifier for assignment to the object at the printing system.

6.   With respect to claim 2, Myers teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the

globally-unique identifier assigned to the object allows the object to be securely and

correctly referenced for re-use (col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 3 and col. 6, lines 30-36 &

47-53). Note that the data is re-used by the account record organization later.

7.   With respect to claim 3, Myers teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the

globally unique identifier assigned to the object is platform-independent (col. 6, lines 42-

46).

        Claim 1, 2, 13-15, 44-49, 67 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Matsuyama U.S. Patent No. 6,330,068.

8.   With respect to claim 1, Matsuyama teaches a method for enabling re-use

presentation objects by a printing system, comprising:

        identifying an object (image tile) in a print data stream for presentation by a

printing system (col. 15, lines 20-28), and

        generating at the printing system (print server having a printer in fig.5) a globally-

unique identifier (path name) for assignment to the object (col. 15, lines 29-38).

        Since the path name uniquely identifies the image tile in the Internet network (col.

3, lines 11-12), the examiner construes it as the claimed globally unique identifier.

9.   With respect to claim 2, Matsuyama teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the

globally-unique identifier assigned to the object allows the object to be securely and

correctly referenced for re-use (col. 15, lines 29-38).

10.   With respect to claim 13, Matsuyama teaches a method for managing

presentation objects for multiple use, comprising:

    downloading to a printer a presentation object (image tile) identified in a print

data stream (col. 16, lines 16-23);

    caching the presentation object in a cache of the printer when the presentation

object is downloaded (col. 16, lines 29-36); and

    capturing the presentation object in a memory (HDD 2009) if a globally-unique

identifier (path name or image tile ID) has been assigned to the presentation object (col.

16, lines 23-28).

11.   With respect to claim 14, Matsuyama teaches the method of claim 13, wherein

the memory comprises permanent storage (HDD 2009).

12.   With respect to claim 15, Matsuyama teaches the method of claim 13 further

comprising deleting previously captured object to increase available capture storage

area in the memory (col. 17, lines 35-29).

13.   With respect to claim 44, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 13,

are applicable.

14.   With respect to claim 45, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 15,

are applicable.

15.   With respect to claim 46, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 15,

are applicable.

16.   With respect to claim 47, Matsuyama discloses the print server deleting

previously downloaded or active objects (col. 17, lines 30-34).

17.   With respect to claim 48, Matsuyama discloses the system comprising a printer

control unit for marking deleted objects in capture storage as removable (marking the

discard time in col. 17, lines 30-35).

18.   With respect to claim 49, Matsuyama discloses the removable object is deleted

when a capture request is received to make storage available to capture a new

resource (col. 17, lines 30-35).

19.   With respect to claim 67, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 13,

are applicable.

20.   With respect to claim 68, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 15,

are applicable.

        Claims 50-52, 54, 55, 58 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Irons et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,427,032 (hereinafter Irons).

21.   With respect to claim 50, Irons discloses a system for processing referenced

objects, comprising:

        a print server for searching for a presentation object referenced by a selected

indicia in a print data stream (col. 23, lines 13-22), the selected indicia being a name, a

globally-unique identifier or a globally-unique identifier and an object locator (col. 23,

lines 1-12); and

a control unit for capturing the presentation object in persistent memory (col. 23,

lines 39-54);

wherein the control unit determines if the presentation object is to be captured

based upon whether the selected indicia include a globally-unique identifier (col. 23,

lines 1-4).

22.   With respect to claim 51, Irons discloses the system of claim 50 wherein the data

stream references the object by an object name and the print server searches for the

object by object name (col. 23, lines 1-22).

23.   With respect to claim 52, Irons discloses the system of claim 51 wherein the print

server attempts to find the object resident in a presentation device (col. 8, lines 1-15)

when the object is referenced with a globally-unique identifier (col. 11, lines 45-59).

24.   With respect to claim 54, Irons discloses the system of claim 50, wherein the

control unit references the object by a globally-unique identifier (col. 11, lines 45-59).

25.   With respect to claim 55, Irons discloses the system of claim 54, wherein the

print server attempts to find the object resident in the presentation device (col. 8, lines

1-15) using a globally-unique identifier (col. 11, lines 45-59).

26.   With respect to claim 58, Irons discloses the system of claim 50, wherein the

data stream references the object by a globally-unique identifier and an object locator

(col. 23, lines 1-12).

27.   With respect to claim 59, Irons discloses the system of claim 58 wherein the print

server attempts to find the object by searching for a resident globally-unique identifier

(col. 11, lines 45-59).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Myers as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Herriot U.S. Patent No.

6,134,583.

28.   With respect to claim 4, Myers teaches the method of claim 1, but Myers does

not teach expressly that the globally-unique identifier is based upon an International

Standards Organization administered global naming tree.

As previously cited in the Office action dated 2/26/04, Herriot, the same field

of endeavor of accessing presentation objects by globally unique identifier, teaches a

method of enabling re-use of presentation objects by an computer system, comprising:

identifying an object for presentation (HTML document) by a computer system

(col. 10, lines 1-31), and

assigning a globally-unique identifier to the object (col. 10, lines 32-40 & col. 22, lines 47-64) wherein the globally-unique identifier is based upon an International Standards Organization administered global naming tree (col. 10, lines 32-67).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the International Standards Organization administered global naming tree method of Herriot into the assigning globally unique identifier to print objects method of Myers.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to provide the method for organizing each and every object by assigning OID value using ISO system (col. 10, lines 48-60 of Herriot).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Myers with Herriot to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

29.   With respect to claim 5, Myers teaches the method of claim 1, but Myers does not teach expressly that the globally-unique identifier is contained in a syntax structure of a data stream.

Herriot, the same field of endeavor of accessing presentation objects by globally unique identifier, teaches that the globally-unique identifier is contained in a syntax structure of a data stream (col. 9, lines 37-44 & col. 10, lines 35-40).

Also, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4, are applicable.

30.   With respect to claim 6, Herriot teaches that the document is made up of mixed object data (col. 4, lines 46-56 of Herriot). Therefore, the reference teaches the limitations of the invention as specified in claim 6.

31.   With respect to claim 7, Myers teaches the method of claim 1, but Myers does

not teach expressly the assigning a globally unique identifier further comprises:

requesting, in an ISO administered global naming tree, a first node for an

application that uses the object;

registering, under the first node, a second node for each license of the

application; and

assigning a globally-unique identifier for the object, the globally-unique identifier

including an indication of the object, the first node and the second node.

Again, Herriot, the same field of endeavor of accessing presentation objects by

globally unique identifier, teaches the assigning a globally unique identifier further

comprises:

requesting, in an ISO administered global naming tree, a first node for an

application that uses the object (ISO in col. 10, lines 54-56);

registering, under the first node, a second node for each license of the

application ("registration authority" in col. 10, lines 56-58); and

assigning a globally-unique identifier for the object (col. 10, lines 32-40 & col. 22,

lines 47-64), the globally-unique identifier including an indication of the object, the first

node and the second node (col. 10, lines 41-58).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to implement the International Standards Organization administered global

naming tree method of Herriot into the assigning globally unique identifier to print

objects method of Myers.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to provide the method

for organizing each and every object by assigning OID value using ISO system (col. 10,

lines 48-60 of Herriot).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Myers with Herriot to obtain

the invention as specified in claim 7.

32.   With respect to claim 8, Myers teaches the method of claim 1, but Myers does

not teach expressly the assigning a globally-unique identifier further comprises

generating a globally-unique identifier for an object, the generated globally-unique

identifier includes an indication of a first node representing an application that uses the

object, of a second node for each license of the application and of the object.

Again, Herriot, the same field of endeavor of accessing presentation objects by

globally unique identifier, teaches the assigning a globally unique identifier further

comprises generating a globally-unique identifier for an object (col. 10, lines 32-40 &

col. 22, lines 47-64), the generated globally-unique identifier includes an indication of a

first node representing an application that uses the object (ISO in col. 10, lines 54-56),

of a second node for each license of the application and of the object ("registration

authority" in col. 10, lines 56-58).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to implement the International Standards Organization administered global

naming tree method of Herriot into the assigning globally unique identifier to print

objects method of Myers.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to provide the method for organizing each and every object by assigning OID value using ISO system (col. 10, lines 48-60 of Herriot).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Myers with Herriot to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

33.   With respect to claim 9, Myers teaches that the indication of the object includes a time stamp (col. 5, line 1).

34.   With respect to claim 10, Myers teaches that the time stamp includes an indication of the date and time (col. 5, line 1).

35.   With respect to claim 11, both Herriot and Myers do not explicitly teach the indication of object including a checksum value. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that including a checksum in a data representing the object is well known in the art.

According to the Hansen dictionary, checksum is commonly used to determine the integrity of data that has been received.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to use checksum value described in the dictionary to determine whether the data has been accurately received by the client computer of Herriot.

36.   With respect to claim 12, Herriot teaches that the indication of the object includes a binary counter (col. 13, lines 19-33).

Claims 3-8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Matsuyama as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Herriot.

37.   With respect to claim 3, Matsuyama teaches the method of claim 1 but it does

not teach expressly that the globally unique identifier assigned to the object is platform-

independent.

As previously cited in the Office action dated 2/26/04, Herriot, the same field

of endeavor of accessing presentation objects by globally unique identifier, teaches a

method of enabling re-use of presentation objects by an computer system, comprising:

identifying an object for presentation (HTML document) by a computer system

(col. 10, lines 1-31), and

assigning a globally-unique identifier to the object (col. 10, lines 32-40 & col. 22,

lines 47-64) wherein the globally-unique identifier is platform independent (col. 10, lines

10-17).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to implement the platform independent International Standards Organization

administered global naming tree method of Herriot into the assigning globally unique

identifier to print objects method of Matsuyama.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to provide the method

for organizing each and every object by assigning platform independent OID value

using ISO system (col. 10, lines 48-60 of Herriot).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Matsuyama with Herriot to

obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

38.   With respect to claim 4, Matsuyama teaches the method of claim 1, but

Matsuyama does not teach expressly that the globally-unique identifier is based upon

an International Standards Organization administered global naming tree.

As previously cited in the Office action dated 2/26/04, Herriot, the same field

of endeavor of accessing presentation objects by globally unique identifier, teaches a

method of enabling re-use of presentation objects by an computer system, comprising:

identifying an object for presentation (HTML document) by a computer system

(col. 10, lines 1-31), and

assigning a globally-unique identifier to the object (col. 10, lines 32-40 & col. 22,

lines 47-64) wherein the globally-unique identifier is based upon an International

Standards Organization administered global naming tree (col. 10, lines 32-67).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to implement the International Standards Organization administered global

naming tree method of Herriot into the assigning globally unique identifier to print

objects method of Matsuyama.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to provide the method

for organizing each and every object by assigning OID value using ISO system (col. 10,

lines 48-60 of Herriot).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Matsuyama with Herriot to

obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

39.   With respect to claim 5, Matsuyama teaches the method of claim 1, but Myers

does not teach expressly that the globally-unique identifier is contained in a syntax

structure of a data stream.

Herriot, the same field of endeavor of accessing presentation objects by globally

unique identifier, teaches that the globally-unique identifier is contained in a syntax

structure of a data stream (col. 9, lines 37-44 & col. 10, lines 35-40).

Also, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4, are applicable.

40.   With respect to claim 6, Herriot teaches that the document is made up of mixed

object data (col. 4, lines 46-56 of Herriot). Therefore, the reference teaches the

limitations of the invention as specified in claim 6.

41.   With respect to claim 7, Matsuyama teaches the method of claim 1, but Myers

does not teach expressly the assigning a globally unique identifier further comprises:

requesting, in an ISO administered global naming tree, a first node for an

application that uses the object;

registering, under the first node, a second node for each license of the

application; and

assigning a globally-unique identifier for the object, the globally-unique identifier

including an indication of the object, the first node and the second node.

Again, Herriot, the same field of endeavor of accessing presentation objects by

globally unique identifier, teaches the assigning a globally unique identifier further

comprises:

requesting, in an ISO administered global naming tree, a first node for an

application that uses the object (ISO in col. 10, lines 54-56);

registering, under the first node, a second node for each license of the

application ("registration authority" in col. 10, lines 56-58); and

assigning a globally-unique identifier for the object (col. 10, lines 32-40 & col. 22,

lines 47-64), the globally-unique identifier including an indication of the object, the first

node and the second node (col. 10, lines 41-58).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to implement the International Standards Organization administered global

naming tree method of Herriot into the assigning globally unique identifier to print

objects method of Matsuyama.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to provide the method

for organizing each and every object by assigning OID value using ISO system (col. 10,

lines 48-60 of Herriot).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Matsuyama with Herriot to

obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

42.   With respect to claim 8, Matsuyama teaches the method of claim 1, but

Matsuyama s does not teach expressly the assigning a globally-unique identifier further

comprises generating a globally-unique identifier for an object, the generated globally-

unique identifier includes an indication of a first node representing an application that

uses the object, of a second node for each license of the application and of the object.

Again, Herriot, the same field of endeavor of accessing presentation objects by globally unique identifier, teaches the assigning a globally unique identifier further comprises generating a globally-unique identifier for an object (col. 10, lines 32-40 & col. 22, lines 47-64), the generated globally-unique identifier includes an indication of a first node representing an application that uses the object (ISO in col. 10, lines 54-56), of a second node for each license of the application and of the object ("registration authority" in col. 10, lines 56-58).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the International Standards Organization administered global naming tree method of Herriot into the assigning globally unique identifier to print objects method of Matsuyama.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to provide the method for organizing each and every object by assigning OID value using ISO system (col. 10, lines 48-60 of Herriot).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Matsuyama with Herriot to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

43.   With respect to claim 11, both Herriot and Matsuyama do not explicitly teach the indication of object including a checksum value. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that including a checksum in a data representing the object is well known in the art.

According to the Hansen dictionary, checksum is commonly used to determine the integrity of data that has been received.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to use checksum value described in the dictionary to determine whether the data has been accurately received by the client computer of Herriot.

44.   With respect to claim 12, Herriot teaches that the indication of the object includes a binary counter (col. 13, lines 19-33).

Claim 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Matsuyama and Herriot as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Myers.

45.   With respect to claims 9 and 10, the combination of Matsuyama and Herriot does not teach expressly that the indication of the object includes a time stamp value wherein the time stamp includes an indication of the data and time.

Myers, the same field of endeavor of accessing presentation objects by globally unique identifier, teaches that the indication of object includes a time stamp wherein the time stamp includes an indication of the data and time (col. 5, line 1).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the time stamp of Myers into the system of Matsuyama and Herriot.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to indicate when the object was save/created.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the three references to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9 and 10.

Claims 13-18, 44-49, 67 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Irons in view of McLachlan U.S. Patent No. 6,144,458.

46.   With respect to claim 13, Irons teaches a method for managing presentation

objects for multiple use, comprising:

downloading to a printer a presentation object (electronic documents) identified

(e-mail document) in a print data stream (e-mail network in col. 9, lines 51-55);

caching the presentation object in a cache of the printer when the presentation

object is downloaded (col. 9, lines 57-59); and

capturing the presentation object in a memory (database) if a globally-unique

identifier has been assigned to the presentation object (col. 9, lines 60-67 & col. 8, line

65 – col. 9, line 18).

It is ~~inherent~~/obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that caching the

downloaded document in a memory/cache before printing the document is well known

in the art printing art.

Irons, however, does not teach expressly that the memory is included in the

printer.

McLachlan, the same field of endeavor of printing art, teaches a method for

identifying whether the transmitted object is never stored in a memory of a printer (fig. 2)

and storing the object along with a unique identifier in the memory of the printer for re-

use.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method for storing the object data in the memory of the printer with the method for capturing the object with a globally-unique identifier.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the downloading time of the object by storing the object in the printer.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine McLachlan with Irons to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

47.   With respect to claim 14, McLachlan teaches that the memory is a permanent storage (col. 3, line 59 – col. 4, line 15).

48.   With respect to claim 15, McLachlan teaches the method comprising deleting previously captured objects to increase available capture storage area in the memory (col. 3, line 59 – col. 4, line 15).

49.   With respect to claims 16, 17 and 18, the combination of McLachlan and Irons does not teach expressly the method of deleting non-active, least recently used, largest or smallest objects first. However, as previously cited in the Office action dated 2/26/04, Examiner takes Official Notice that setting a priority based on the size of the data and deleting based on the priority set by the user is well known in the memory management art. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to set the memory management device delete one of non-active, largest or smallest objects based on the user defined parameter to increase the availability of the memory.

50.   With respect to claim 44, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 13, are applicable.

51.   With respect to claim 45, McLachlan discloses the system comprising a print server (col. 2, lines 20-30), the print server deleting previously captured objects in the printer capture storage (col. 4, lines 6-10).

52.   With respect to claim 46, McLachlan discloses the system comprising a print server (col. 2, lines 20-30), the print server deleting previously downloaded or active objects (col. 4, lines 12-15).

53.   With respect to claim 47, McLachlan discloses the system wherein the previously downloaded or active objects exist in the capture storage or cache storage (col. 4, lines 1-15).

54.   With respect to claim 48, McLachlan discloses the system comprising a printer control unit for marking deleted objects in the capture storage as removable (col. 4, lines 12-15).

55.   With respect to claim 49, McLachlan discloses the system wherein a removable object is deleted when a capture request is received to make storage available to capture a new resource (col. 4, lines 1-15).

56.   With respect to claim 67, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 13, are applicable.

57.   With respect to claim 68, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 15, are applicable.

Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irons as applied to claim 52 above, and further in view of Matsuyama.

58.   With respect to claim 53, Irons discloses the system of claim 52 wherein the object is referenced from a secure environment (col. 20, lines 11-14; col. 31, lines 9-11, 55-67; & col. 32, lines 32-39). Irons, however does not disclose expressly that the print server downloads the object and the control unit captures the object when the attempt to find the resident object fails.

Matsuyama, the same field of endeavor of network printing art, discloses a print server that downloads an object and a control unit that captures the object when the attempt to find the resident object fails (col. 15, lines 39-44 and col. 19, lines 39-46).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the globally-unique object identifier of Irons with the downloading the object from other server of Matsuyama.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to use the globally-unique identifier to locate the object data stored in other servers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Irons with Matsuyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 53.

Claims 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irons as applied to claim 55 above, and further in view of Matsuyama.

59.   With respect to claim 56, Matsuyama discloses a print system wherein a print

server searches for the resource inline (other print servers in network) when the search

for a resident globally identifier fails (col. 15, lines 39-44 and col. 19, lines 39-46).

Arguments analogous to those presented for claim 53, are applicable.

60.   With respect to claim 57, Irons discloses that the object is referenced from a

secure environment (col. 20, lines 11-14; col. 31, lines 9-11, 55-67; & col. 32, lines 32-

39). Arguments analogous to those presented for claim 53, are applicable.

Claims 60-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Irons as applied to claim 59 above, and further in view of Matsuyama.

61.   With respect to claim 60, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 53,

are applicable.

62.   With respect to claim 61, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 57,

are applicable.

63.   With respect to claim 62, Matsuyama discloses a print system wherein a print

server looks for the object by object locator in a resource library (image server 102)

when the inline search is unsuccessful (col. 15, lines 39-44 and col. 19, lines 39-46).

64.   With respect to claim 63, Irons discloses the print server that determines whether

the globally-unique identifier assigned to the object matches the globally unique

identifier referenced (col. 23, lines 1-21).

65.   With respect to claim 64, Irons discloses that the server downloads the object

and the control unit captures the object by the globally unique identifier if the globally

unique identifier assigned to the object matches the globally unique identifier referenced (col. 23, lines 1-21).

66.   With respect to claim 65, Matsuyama discloses that an indication of an error is provided if the identifier assigned to the object does not match the identifier referenced (image object not found in any of the print server in col. 15, lines 29-44 and col. 19, lines 39-46).

67.   With respect to claim 66, Matsuyama discloses the print server for checking whether the object contain a globally-unique identifier. Note that when the identifier is not contain in the image it assigns one the object at step S1111. Additionally, Matsuyama discloses a display for displaying system running state (col. 8, lines 33-37). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to notify the user when the object is not stored within system by analyzing the presence of the identifier.

Conclusion

68.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

69.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to CHAN S PARK whose telephone number is (703) 305-

2448. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (703) 305-4712. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

csp
December 23, 2004

Chan S. Park
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600